APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/360,068	07/23/1999	KEVIN J. PAGE	014801-000400US	3638

20350 7590 02/20/2008	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP	KLIMACH, PAULA W	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER		
EIGHTH FLOOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834	2135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/360,068	PAGE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paula W. Klimach	2135	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-18,20-27,29-35 and 59* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29-35, 59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 11/30/07. The amendment filed

on 11/30/07 has been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently pending claims are 1-2,

4-18, 20-27, 29-35, and 59.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/30/07 have been fully considered.   However the

arguments are not found persuasive.

The applicant argued that Claim 1 recites a method for establishing a secure

communication link through a communication network. In response to applicant's arguments,

the recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble.

A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose

of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend

on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able

to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*,

187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

The applicant argued further that the smart card communication device produces an

outgoing secure data signal without deciphering the secured data. This is not found persuasive.

In the combination of Naccache and Hohle, Naccache teaches the message enciphered at the

smart card and sent to the device B while the system of Hohle discloses the communication from

the access point to the central computer (Hohle column 5 lines 64-67).

The applicant argued further that communication over a network is different than communication over a communication network. This is not persuasive because the definition of a network is a group of computers and associated devices that are connected by communication facilities. In the case if Naccache the smart card is the associated device which communicates with the computer and the communication interface corresponds to the communication facilities.

The applicant argued further that Naccache fails to teach or suggest a central system that is remote from the smart card. This is found persuasive because in the combination of Naccache and Hohle, Hohle discloses the communication from the access point to the central computer (Hohle column 5 lines 64-67).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., data integrity from a smart card <u>passing through a smart card device and communication network, and further to a remote central computer system</u>) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that the communication of data in Naccache is attributed to the physical communication through a communication interface, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 29-35, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Hohle et al (6,101,477) in view of Naccache (5,414,772) and further in view of Hilton.

In reference to claim 1, Hohle teaches a system for establishing a secure connection

between a smart card and a central computer (issuer 10), Fig.10. The system uses the method of

outgoing secure signal transmitted from the smart card to produce an out going secure data

signal, column 3 lines 31-51. The connection described by Hohle is a secure connection because

the system uses the DES algorithm for encryption of a random number in the challenge/response

authentication, column 11 line 63 to column 12 line 36. Since that data is sent over the network

disclosed in Fig. 10, it must be system, issuer 10. The card is described as communicating with

the issuer 10 through the client formatted in accordance with a communication network protocol

to produce an outgoing format. Finally, in column 5 line 64 to column 6 line 4, the formatted

signal is sent to the central computer host (the access point) and therefore, for communication to

take place a signal must be sent from the card to the central computer system.

Hohle further discloses the signal, in the form of a message, formatted to allow the   .

central computer system to detect a modification to the secured data occurring during

transmission beginning at the smart card and extending to the central computer system (column

22 lines 47-67). The message of Hohle is signed in order to determine whether the message has been altered during transmission.

Although Hohle discloses a system wherein the smart card transactions have a security dimension (column 21 line 43 to column 22 line 36), Hohle does not expressly disclose the outgoing transmission sent without deciphering the data. In addition Hohle does not teach receiving at a smart card communication device an outgoing message and using the smart card communication device to produce an outgoing secure data signal.

Naccache discloses a system that comprises at least two parts, connected to each other by the means of a common communication interface (abstract). Naccache discloses receiving at a smart card communication device an outgoing transmission sent without deciphering the data (part 10 Fig 1 in combination with column 4 lines 15-21). In addition Naccache teaches receiving at a smart card communication device an outgoing message and using the smart card communication device to produce an outgoing secure data signal (column 5 lines 60-66 in combination with column 2 lines 56-58), and communicating to a central computer system that is remote from the smart card communication device (column 6 lines 1-11 in combination with Fig. 3) wherein the computer, device B, corresponds the central computer system.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the security function in the smart card as in Naccache in the system of Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the communication of data takes negligible time when compared to the effort for computing modular inverses.

Although Hohle discloses secure contactless communications that utilize inductive couplings, Hohle does not disclose RF communications and therefore demodulating an outgoing radio frequency signal transmitted from the smart card to produce an outgoing signal.

Hilton discloses RF communications between a smartcard and the field device (Fig. 4). Therefore Hilton suggests the demodulation of an outgoing radio frequency signal transmitted form the smart card to produce an outgoing signal (column 3 line 50 to column 4 line 1). The RF communications disclosed by Hilton includes the receiving and transmitting of a radio frequency signal (Fig. 4).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the RF communication as in the system of Hilton between the smart card and central system of Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because RF communication and inductive communication links are interchangeable methods of contactless communication for smart cards (column 1 lines 11-20).

In reference to claim 29 Hohle discloses the secure data formatted by the smart card to allow the central computer system to detect a modification to the secure data occurring during transmission (column 22 lines 47-67).

Hohle discloses a contactless smart card, however Hohle does not expressly disclose expressly a communication interface for transmission beginning at the smart card and extending to the central computer system without deciphering the secure data.

Naccache discloses a system that comprises at least two parts, connected to each other by the means of a common communication interface (abstract). The system includes the transmission beginning at the smart card and extending to the central computer system (Fig. 3).

A data communication interface adapted to exchange the secure data with the processor through a baseband data communication channel without deciphering the secure data (part 10 Fig 1 in combination with column 4 lines 15-21).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the security function in the smart card as in Naccache in the system of Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the communication of data takes negligible time when compared to the effort for computing modular inverses.

Although Hohle discloses secure contactless communications that utilize inductive couplings, Hohle does not disclose RF communications.

Hilton discloses a radio frequency transceiver adapted to exchange secure data with a smart card through a radio frequency communication channel (column 3 line 50 to column 4 line 1). The RF communications disclosed by Hilton includes the receiving and transmitting of a radio frequency signal (Fig. 4).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the RF communication as in the system of Hilton between the smart card and central system of Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because RF communication and inductive communication links are interchangeable methods of contactless communication for smart cards (column 1 lines 11-20).

In reference to claims 2 and 30, Hohle subjects the out going data to a security function only in the smart card and the central computer system. The data is "signed" by the central computer by producing the MAC, column 22 lines 53-58. The card then produces a MAC based

on the received message and compares them and the two MACs will not match if the message or

the wrong key has been used, column 22 lines 59-67.

In reference to claim 4, in the system of Hohle the data at the central computer (the bank

computer 150) is transformed back into plain text, column 16 lines 45-47. The data is sent over

the network to the central computer, column 16 line 34, as a result, it is apparent that it must

have been reformatted.

In reference to claim 5, the system disclosed by Hohle receives the incoming secure

formatted signal from the central computer as discussed in claim 1. Wilson teaches that

communication in the opposite direction, in this case from the central computer to the smart card,

may be performed in the same way, column 15 lines 30-43.

In reference to claims 6 and 33, the Hohle reference teaches of contactless cards using

phase, frequency and amplitude modulation, column 3 lines 44-45, therefore the reader

demodulates the signal sent over radio frequencies. Wilson teaches applying cipher text to a

decryption module to arrive at the plain text, column 15 lines 30-51.

In reference to claim 7, the security function is as discussed above in the discussion for

claim 6.

In reference to claims 8 and 34, the data is encoded in the smart card, as discussed for

claim 3, which would make the outgoing data signal secure.

In reference to claim 9, Hohle further teaches generating a MAC at the smart card and

then appending it to the outgoing data as a electronic seal to sigh the data, column 22 lines 47-67.

In reference to claim 10, 11, 15, 16, and 35, Hohle discusses the use of a MAC to seal

messages with in order to detect an unauthorized modification of the outgoing data, column 22

lines 47-67.

In reference to claim 14, Hohle discloses a system where a MAC and appended to the

message, column 22 lines 47-67.

In reference to claim 17, encoding using a smart card and transmitting the radio

frequencies, the modulation of the outgoing radio frequency, formatting of the secure data, and

the transmission of outgoing data has been discussed in reference to claim 1. The reformatting

of the outgoing secure signal and decoding of the signal has been discussed in reference to claim

4. While the reference to claim 8 discusses the encoding of information from the central

computer. It is evident that since the signal is sent over the network, it would be formatted to

produce an incoming formatted signal. The reference to claim 5 discusses the receiving,

reformatting, and transmission of the secure signal. Finally the demodulation and the decoding

of the secure data signal is discussed in reference to claim 6. Hohle's further discloses the using

a message authentication code for a signing. The signing is used to determine whether the

message was altered during transmission (column 22 lines 37-67). Wherein the system allows

for the signing in both directions to and from the smart card (column 22 lines 57-58).

In reference to claim 12-13, 31-32, Naccache discusses the use of a smart card to encrypt

data using software stored on the card and being able to perform the communication in both

directions (column 4 lines 49-61).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to encrypt the data in the smart card as in Naccache in the system of Hohle. One

of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would discourage a third party from intercepting unencrypted data.

In reference to claim 59 wherein the secured data is formatted to allow the central computer system to authenticate identity of the sender (Hohle column 21 line 63 to column 22 line 14).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hohle in view of Murphy et al (6, 226, 744 B1) and further in view of Hilton and further in view of Naccache.

In reference to claim 21, Hohle discloses a system for communication between a smart card and a central computer with the ability for some of the software to exist outside the card and be downloaded during transaction, column 4 lines 49-54. The secure data is exchanged with the smart card reader, column 3 lines 42-45. Although Hohle discloses a system that includes an authentication process, Hohle does not disclose a system where interface software can be downloaded to perform the authentication. Hohle further discloses the signal, in the form of a message, formatted to allow the central computer system to detect a modification to the secured data occurring during transmission beginning at the smart card and extending to the central computer system (column 22 lines 47-67). The message of Hohle is signed in order to determine whether the message has been altered during transmission.

Murphy discloses a system where a user can download a smart card interface module to the client terminal for the authentication process, column 6 lines 8-25. The secure gateway server corresponds to the HTTP server recited in claim 21. A HTTP server by definition is a software that uses HTTP documents and any associated files and scripts when requested by a

client, such as a web browser. The gateway server disclosed by Murphy communicates with the

client (web browser) and therefore by necessity uses HTTP to communicate (column 6 lines 8-

21).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to add the Client terminal 14 described by Murphy to download the interface for

the authentication process disclosed by Hohle and using the smart card and smart card reader

disclosed by Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this

because users would be able to access restricted information with the smart card without having

to install software, column 3 lines 24-28.

Although Hohle discloses secure contactless communications that utilize inductive

couplings, Hohle does not disclose RF communications and therefore demodulating an outgoing

radio frequency signal transmitted from the smart card to produce an outgoing signal.

Hilton discloses RF communications between a smartcard and the field device (Fig. 4).

Therefore Hilton suggests the demodulation of an outgoing radio frequency signal transmitted

form the smart card to produce an outgoing signal (column 3 line 50 to column 4 line 1).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to use the RF communication as in the system of Hilton between the smart card

and central system of Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do

this because RF communication and inductive communication links are interchangeable methods

of contactless communication for smart cards (column 1 lines 11-20).

Although Hohle discloses a system wherein the smart card transactions have a security

dimension (column 21 line 43 to column 22 line 36), Hohle does not expressly disclose the

outgoing transmission sent without deciphering the data. Hohle also does not disclose a local

smart card communication to a smart card. Although Murphy discloses downloading software to

a smartcard, Murphy does not disclose exchanging the secure data between the smart card

through a network and the processor is located remotely from the central computer system.

Naccache discloses a system comprising at least two parts connected to each other by

means of a common communication interface (abstract). The secured data of the system of

Naccache is formatted by the smart card (Fig. 1). The system includes the central computer

(computer) system that is configured to detect the modification to the secured data and to process

a transaction for the smart card using the secured data included in the outgoing formatted secure

signal (Fig. 3). Since the smart card contains the communication interface (Fig. 1), the secure

data is not deciphered (column 14 lines 40-55). Naccache teaches further a smart card that is

configured to communicate securely with a central computer (Fig. 3).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to perform the security function in the smart card as in Naccache in the system of

Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the

communication of data takes negligible time when compared to the effort for computing modular

inverses.

Claims 18, 20, 22, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Murphy et al. (6,226744 B1) in view of Hilton et al (6304223) and further in view of

Naccache.

In reference to claim 18, Murphy discloses exchanging the secure data through a communication network with the central computer system (column 4 lines 44-48 column 3 lines 30-50) wherein central computer system is the combination of computers as in Fig 1 parts 18, 22, 24, 20, and 26; and performing a security function on the data at the central computer system (column 6 lines 32-49). The system of Murphy discloses performing a security function at the smart card on secure data received from the central computer system (column 6 lines 56-63). Murphy further discloses the system having the ability to access restricted information from the servers. However the user uses the smart card for authentication in order to receive the data. Access control using the smart card is a security function that is performed on the secure data, restricted data, in order for the user to receive the restricted data.

Although Murphy discloses a smart card that is coupled with a client device (Fig. 1), the smart card is not a contactless smart card.

Hilton discloses a contactless card smart card (abstract). Secure data is exchanged through a radio frequency communication channel with the smart card (column 3 lines 50-67).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the card reader and smart card in Murphy to be contactless RF communications as in Hilton. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the device will not require contact between the smart card and the validator (Hilton column 1 lines 10-15).

Although Murphy discloses the smart card performing security functions such as signatures, Murphy does not actually disclose signing data in order to determine whether the data was altered during transmission.

Naccache discloses a system comprising at least two parts connected to each other by means of a common communication interface (abstract). The secured data of the system of Naccache is formatted by the smart card (Fig. 3). The system includes the central computer (verification device) system that is configured to detect the modification to the secured data and to process a transaction for the smart card using the secured data included in the outgoing formatted secure signal (Fig. 3). Since the smart card contains the communication interface (Fig. 1), the secure data is not deciphered (column 14 lines 40-55). Naccache teaches further a smart card that is configured to communicate securely with a central computer (Fig. 3).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the security function in the smart card as in Naccache in the system of Hohle. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the communication of data takes negligible time when compared to the effort for computing modular inverses.

In reference to claim 20, since the data is transported over the network as shown in Fig 1, the data is evidently formatted in accordance with the communication network protocol for the network in Fig. 1, and reformatted at the central computer. The data is transmitted through the communication network as shown in Fig. 1.

In reference to claim 22, the secure data is exchanged over a baseband channel, Murphy fig 1 where the smart card reader is connected to a client terminal, which then connects to the network. Murphy discloses a system that exchanges data with a central computer.

In reference to claim 25, the smart card reader described by Murphy is connected to a client terminal, Fig. 1. The smart card reader described by Hilton is a proximity card. In

Murphy Fig. 1 the access points are connected to a network. The central computer authenticates the smart card; therefore has a security device coupled to it (column 6 lines 32-49).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the card reader and smart card in Murphy to be contactless RF communications as in Hilton. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the device will not require contact between the smart card and the validator (Hilton column 1 lines 10-15).

In reference to claim 26, the client terminal in Murphy works on the Internet (Fig. 1).

In reference to claims 23, the secure data is not deciphered within the communication link (Fig. 1).

In reference to claims 24, the step of subjecting the secure data to a security function only at the smart card and at the and at the central computer (column 5 lines 51-67).

In reference to claim 27 is the same discussion as in the reference to claim 23 and 24.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Paula W. Klimach whose telephone number is (571) 272-3854.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thr 9:30 a.m to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PWK

Thursday, February 14, 2008

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

2/19/08